

Rome, 16 January 2023

I would like to thank the IGF for the opportunity to participate in the IGF 2022 taking stock process.

I share some considerations in my personal capacity

IGF Budget 2022: What worked well? What didn't work so well?

My compliments go to the IGF Secretariat team and to the MAG for the excellent work done in 2022. I think there has been a significant improvement in the quality of the IGF sessions both in terms of content and quality of discussion and speakers. Stakeholder participation was great, but I think the IGF should try to involve the private sector and the technical community more.

The preparatory process of the IGF worked well in terms of organizing the workshop and requesting thematic inputs. Some information about high-level leaders' track groups was shared at the last minute.

The NRI sessions were well organized and attended as the sessions related to the other intersessional activities (DC, BPF, PNE).

The participation of young people was also great.

My participation took place remotely. I had some technical issues on day zero and day 1 of the IGF as I was sometimes unable to connect.

The hybrid format has also worked well although there could be room for improvement.

Suggestions for improvements for IGF 2023

Needless to say, while representing the most important platform for debate on Internet Governance issues, IGF cannot find the right international dimension and is currently underestimated for the contribution and impact it could provide to the processes of management and evolution of the Internet.

In my view the main reason is that the platform and the results of the debate are not properly linked to other debates taking place in the international arena. Nor are NRIs work and of many

other intersessional activities. Until these links are activated, the future of IGF will continue to be uncertain.

A greater valorisation of the IGF can therefore be pursued only by strengthening these links and creating synergies with all the other institutions that deal with the management and evolution of the Internet at a national and international level.

If the IGF debate does not give tangible results, if it does not generate concrete projects and initiatives from stakeholders, based on the comparisons and debate that have taken place, it will remain an initiative for discussion and awareness that is very limited compared to its potential.

Certainly the activation of the Leadership Panel is a big step forward and will lend a hand, but a significant strengthening of the IGF Secretariat is needed in terms of human resources, funds and also the right placement of the IGF Secretariat in the context of the United Nations.

I hope the WSIS+20 process takes this into account.

With the hope that all this can be implemented, I propose that in the next IGF there is an improvement in terms of:

1. Accountability: Measure the degree of impact that IGF discussions have globally and improve it.
2. Interconnection: promote, valorise and link the results of the IGF with other initiatives dealing with the same themes and improve communication.
3. Continuity: ensure continuity between one IGF and another by focusing on specific topics and avoiding the dispersion of the debate (Multi-year Plan).
4. Integrate NRIs participation and other intersessional activities into the annual program design.
5. Increase the participation of young people and other categories by promoting training on the functioning of the Internet and IGF processes (IG School).

Best regards,

Concettina Cassa (former MAG member 2018- 2020)